PETE V. DOMENICI
UNITED STATES SENATOR
February 9, 2000

Mr. President, I rise to compliment Senator Murkowski's leadership on the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. I appreciate his efforts to enable progress on the nation's need for concrete action on spent nuclear fuel.

I find it amazing how fear of anything in this country with "nuclear" in its title, like "nuclear waste," seems to paralyze our ability to act decisively. Nuclear issues are immediately faced with immense political challenges.

There are many great examples of how nuclear technologies impact our daily lives. Yet few of our citizens know enough about the benefits we've gained from harnessing the nucleus to support actions focused on reducing the remaining risks.

Just one example that should be better understood and appreciated involves our nuclear navy. Their experience has important lessons for better understanding of these technologies.

The Nautilus, our first nuclear powered submarine, was launched in 1954. Since then, the Navy has launched over 200 nuclear powered ships, and about 85 are currently in operation. Recently, the Navy was operating slightly over 100 reactors, about the same number as those operating in civilian power stations across the country.

The Navy's safety record is exemplary. Our nuclear ships are welcomed into over 150 ports in over 50 countries. A 1999 review of their safety record was conducted by the General Accounting Office. That report stated:

> ***"No significant accident - one resulting in fuel degradation - has ever occurred."***

For an Office like GAO, that identifies and publicizes problems with government programs, that's a pretty impressive statement!

Our nuclear powered ships have traveled over 117 million miles without serious incidents. Further, the Navy has commissioned 33 new reactors in the 1990s, that puts them ahead of civilian power by a score of 33 to zero. And Navy reactors have more than twice the operational hours of our civilian systems.

The nuclear navy story is a great American success story, one that is completely

enabled by appropriate and careful use of nuclear power. It's contributed to the freedoms we so cherish.

Nuclear energy is another great American success story. It now supplies about 20 percent of our nation's electricity, it is not a supply that we can afford to lose. It's done it without release of greenhouse gases, with a superlative safety record over the last decade. The efficiency of nuclear plants has risen consistently and their operating costs are among the lowest of all energy sources.

I've repeatedly emphasized that the United States must maintain nuclear energy as a viable option for future energy requirements. And without some near-term waste solution, like interim storage or an early receipt facility, we are killing this option. We may be depriving future generations of a reliable power source that they may desperately need.

There is no excuse for the years that the issue of nuclear waste has been with us. Near-term credible solutions are not technically difficult. We absolutely must progress towards early receipt of spent fuel at a central location, at least faster than the 2010 estimates for opening Yucca Mountain that we now face or risk losing nuclear power in this country.

Senator Murkowski's bill is a significant step toward breaking the deadlock which continues to threaten the future of nuclear energy in the U.S. I appreciate that he made some very tough decisions in crafting this bill that blends ideas from many sources to seek compromise in this difficult area.

One concession involves tying the issuance of a license for the "early receipt facility" to construction authorization for the permanent repository. I'd much prefer that we simply moved ahead with interim storage. An interim storage facility can proceed on its own merits, quite independent of decisions surrounding a permanent repository. Such an interim storage facility could be operational well before the "early receipt facility" authorized in this Act.

There are absolutely no technical issues associated with interim storage in dry casks, other countries certainly use it. Nevertheless, in the interests of seeking a compromise on this issue, I will support this Act's approach with the early receipt facility.

I appreciate that Senator Murkowski has included Title III in the new bill with my

proposal to create a new DOE Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. This new Office would organize a research program to explore new, improved national strategies for spent nuclear fuel.

Spent fuel has immense energy potential - that we are simply tossing away with our focus only on a permanent repository. We could be recycling that spent fuel back into civilian fuel and extracting additional energy. We could follow the examples of France, the U.K., and Japan in reprocessing the fuel to not only extract more energy, but also to reduce the volume and toxicity of the final waste forms.

Now I'm well aware that reprocessing is not viewed as economically desirable now, because of today's very low uranium prices. Furthermore, it must only be done with careful attention to proliferation issues. But I submit that the U.S. should be prepared for a future evaluation that may determine that we are too hasty today to treat this spent fuel as waste, and that instead we should have been viewing it as an energy resource for future generations.

We do not have the knowledge today to make that decision. Title III establishes a research program to evaluate options to provide real data for such a future decision.

This research program would have other benefits. We may want to reduce the toxicity of materials in any repository to address public concerns. Or we may find we need another repository in the future, and want to incorporate advanced technologies into the final waste products at that time. We could, for example, decide that we want to maximize the storage potential of a future repository, and that would require some treatment of the spent fuel before final disposition.

Title III requires that a range of advanced approaches for spent fuel be studied with the new Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. As we do this, I'll encourage the Department to seek international cooperation. I know, based on personal contacts, that France, Russia, and Japan are eager to join with us in an international study of spent fuel options.

Title III requires that we focus on research programs that minimize proliferation and health risks from the spent fuel. And it requires that we study the economic implications of each technology.

With Title III, the United States will be prepared, some years in the future, to make the most intelligent decision regarding the future of nuclear energy as one of our

major power sources. Maybe at that time, we'll have other better energy alternatives and decide that we can move away from nuclear power. Or we may find that we need nuclear energy to continue and even expand its current contribution to our nation's power grid. In any case, this research will provide the framework to guide Congress in these future decisions.

Mr. President, I want to specifically discuss one of the compromises that Senator Murkowski has developed in his Manager's Amendment. In my view, his largest compromise involves the choice between the Environmental Protection Agency or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to set the radiation-protection standards for Yucca Mountain and for the "early release facility."

The NRC has the technical expertise to set these standards. Furthermore, the NRC is a non-political organization, in sharp contrast to the political nature of the EPA. We need unbiased technical knowledge in setting these standards, there should be no place for politics at all. The EPA has proposed a draft standard already, that has been widely criticized for its inconsistency and lack of scientific rigor - events that do not enhance their credibility for this role.

I appreciate, however, the care that Senator Murkowski has demonstrated in providing the ultimate authority to the EPA. His new language requires both the NRC and the National Academy of Sciences to comment on the EPA's draft standard. And he provides a period of time, until mid-2001, for the EPA to assess concerns with their standard and issue a valid standard.

These additions have the effect of providing a strong role for both the NRC and NAS to share their scientific knowledge with the EPA and help guide the EPA toward a credible standard.

The NRC should be complimented for their courageous stand against the EPA in this issue. Their issuance of a scientifically appropriate standard stands in stark contrast to the first effort from the EPA. Thanks to the actions of the NRC, the EPA can be guided toward reasonable standards.

Certainly my preference is to have the NRC issue the final standard. But I appreciate the effort that Senator Murkowski has expended in seeking compromise in this difficult area.

By following the procedures in the Manager's Amendment, we can allow the EPA

to set the final standard, guided by the inputs from the NRC and NAS. Thus, I will support the Manager's Amendment.

Mr. President, I want to thank Senator Murkowski for his superb leadership in preparing this new act. We need to pass this Manager's Amendment with a veto-proof majority, to ensure that we finally attain some movement in the nation's ability to deal with high level nuclear waste.